DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 077 JC 740 400

AUTHOR	Edwards, D. William; And Others
TITLE	Possible Mechanisms for Faculty Participation in Multi-Campus Governance at Valencia Community College.
INSTITUTION	Nova Univ., Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
PUB DATE	30 Jan 74
NOTE	67p.; Practicum submitted to Nova University in partial fulfillment of requirements for Doctor of Education degree
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; *Governance; Multicampus Districts; Post Secondary Education; Practicums; Questionnaires; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS	California; *Valencia Community College

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire was administered to the faculty and administrators of Valencia Community College to obtain answers to the following questions: (1) Will the present faculty organization meet the needs of a multicampus college? (2) Will the present system of administrative committees, councils, and task forces meet the needs of a multicampus college? (3) What is the most acceptable form of faculty participation in governance for a multicampus operation at Valencia? A questionnaire was also administered to a sample of the faculty and administrators of both in-state and out-of-state community colleges with a multicampus operation. The data obtained from the questionnaires were treated descriptively. The results of the study reinforced previous findings that the attitudes of the participants involved in participatory governance are more important than is the specific organizational mode adopted to provide this participation. An open and receptive attitude by the president and other administrators is a key element for effective faculty participation in governance. A strong and dedicated faculty leadership combined with an interested and involved faculty and the administration's attitude will tailor the mechanism to the needs of the participants and insure mutual development of policies and procedures. Another trend that is developing is the necessity to provide a voice for all constitutencies of the college. College Wide Councils are emerging as a policy recommending body in many colleges. (There are eight appendixes to the report, two of which are the questionnaires.) (DB)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 097077

POSSIBLE MECHANISMS FOR FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN MULTI-CAMPUS GOVERNANCE AT VALENCIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

COLLEGE GOVERNANCE MODULE

BY

D. William Edwards, M.S.

Kenneth W. Hise, M.S.

Stanley Melnick, M.S.

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

January 30, 1974

JC 740 400

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Background and Significance. 3

Procedures 6

Results. 9

Valencia Community College Questionnaire. 9

Questionnaire Completed by Personnel of Other Colleges. . 14

Recommendations. 24

Summary Statement by D. William Edwards 26

Summary Statement by Kenneth W. Hise. 29

Summary Statement by Stanley Melnick. 32

Bibliography 34

Appendix A - Letter from President, Valencia Community College to Practicum Director, Nova University 35

Appendix B - Questionnaire Administered to Valencia Community College Personnel 36

Appendix C - Questionnaire Administered to Personnel of Other Colleges 38

Appendix D - Letter from President, Valencia Community College to Other College Presidents 40

Appendix E - Memorandum to Other College Contact Persons . . . 41

Appendix F - Data Derived From Questionnaire Administered to . 42 Valencia Community College Personnel

Appendix G - Data Derived From Questionnaire Administered to . 46 Personnel of Other Colleges

Appendix H - Responsibilities of Individual Practicum. . . . . 64 Participants

INTRODUCTION

Today, more than ever, community colleges are having to assume heavier responsibilities for providing at least two years of college education, preparation for meaningful careers and continuing education to meet the needs of the general public in the areas of job improvement, liesure and recreation. These needs must be provided within the economic and geographic reach of an increasing enrollment.

In Florida this goal will be achieved primarily by opening additional campuses within the existing community college districts. There is definitely a need for information concerning the governance and organization of districts operating more than one campus.

Valencia Community College will be opening an "East Campus" in the Fall of 1975. The President of Valencia Community College and others have expressed the desire and need for a study to explore the various options available to the administration for the effective organization of all elements of the college for a multi-campus operation. (Appendix A.)

One vital aspect of the operation of a multi-campus college is the formulation of procedures and policies that will govern the institution.

That responsible, representative and effective faculty participation is an important part in the formulation of policy and

procedures of a multi-campus community college is a statement that few individuals would deny. Never-the-less, several questions do occur when considering this point of view.

1. Will the present Valencia Community College faculty organization meet the needs of a multi-campus college?

2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of other community college faculty organizations both in Florida and in other states for multi-campus governance?

3. Will the present system of administrative committees, councils and task forces provide viable input on which to base multi-campus administrative decisions?

4. What would be the most acceptable form of faculty participation in multi-campus governance at Valencia Community College?

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The necessity for an effective faculty organization that plays a vital role in the formulation of policies and procedures that govern an institution is given by Pankratz (6). Richardson, Blocker and Bender (7) recommend an organization that will create a positive relationship between the administration and the faculty; that is, an atmosphere will prevail that will make it possible for effective policy formulation and implementation. Monroe (4) revealed that in 1966 the American Association of Junior Colleges through its Committee on Administration convened a meeting of community college representatives for the purpose of formulating guidelines and recommendations for the "appropriate involvement of faculty in institutional policy making." Monroe also noted the importance of faculty participation in all aspects of the affairs of the college. Schimmel (8) advocates a system whereby the "conditional" decisions of college administrators are distributed and then, subject to the reactions of the college population, either implemented or referred to a committee for further study. The above statements would be applicable to single or multi-campus institutions.

The mechanism by which faculty participate in the formulation of policies and procedures is another matter. Historically, faculty participation has taken place via various administrative committees, councils, ad hoc committees and other task forces.

How effective are these participatory bodies in the governance process? Will these bodies meet the needs of a multi-campus institution? What are some recent, innovative structures for faculty participation in the governance process?

In reference to faculty organizations Monroe (4), states that there is almost no information available on the number of community colleges in which faculty organization prevails and worse yet, there is an absence of information on how present faculty organizations function. Monroe asks, "Do the faculty groups influence or control institutional decisions in any decisive manner?" Steger (9) conducted a survey of Illinois community colleges. His report disclosed that the power of the faculty councils were quite limited. Specifically, the powers of the councils were restricted to matters of curriculum and faculty welfare. His survey also revealed that newer community colleges were practicing the policy of the four year colleges, that is, encouraging more faculty participation in the formulation of policy and decision making. A famous study by the American Association for Higher Education (1), disclosed that only 25 per cent of sampled four and two year colleges could be considered as shared authority institutions. The study characterized the community colleges as being under administrative control with some evidence of increased faculty consultation. Demerath (2) sees the chief block to effective shared authority arrangements as the failure of communication between the faculty and the administration.

As stated by Richardson, Block and Bender (7), a participatory model of governance that is suitable for a single-campus

college can be modified for a multi-campus institution. They also suggest that the need for a participational model may be even greater in the multi-institutional district. We must bear in mind that all of the problems that can be found in the bureacratic structure as an organizational form for the individual college are raised to the nth power in a multi-campus district with n the number of campuses. Schimmel (8) proposes to streamline the process and eliminate much duplication and wasted effort by permitting administrators to make the basic decision subject to referral to a committee should resistance to the decision be encountered.

What are some recent, innovative structures for faculty participation in the governance process? Kudde and Multer (3) recommend four institute councils and an assembly that are based on a "federal approach" to governance. Nelson (5) advises the participation of all employed at the college. According to this structure of governance, administrators, students, community groups and non-professional "classified" staff play an important role in the governance of the college.

In summary, reviewed literature verifies that further study is needed to determine the effectiveness of faculty participation in the governance process, especially in reference to the multi-campus college. The literature also reveals the necessity for a participatory structure of governance for the multi-campus college. This study will further analyze faculty participatory models of governance and make recommendations concerning the most acceptable form of faculty participation in multi-campus governance at Valencia Community College.

PROCEDURES

A questionnaire (Appendix B) was administered to the faculty and administrators of Valencia Community College for the purpose of answering the following questions:

1. Will the present faculty organization meet the needs of a multi-campus college?

2. Will the present system of administrative committees, councils and task forces meet the needs of a multi-campus college?

3. What is the most acceptable form of faculty participation in governance for a multi-campus operation at Valencia?

This questionnaire was submitted to each certificated administrator and faculty member with instructions to return it, anonomously, to one of the participants in this practicum. Twelve administrators (31 per cent) and 50 faculty (40 per cent) responded to the questionnaire.

Also, a questionnaire (Appendix C) was administered to a sample of the faculty and administrators of both in state and out of state community colleges with a multi-campus operation. The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the various mechanisms of faculty participation in the governance process at their respective institutions.

Eleven out of state and six Florida colleges known to operate within a multi-campus environment were selected at random for possible survey. The President of Valencia Community

College, on approving the project, agreed to write letters to each of these college presidents and solicit their cooperation. (Appendix D) A copy of the proposed questionnaire was enclosed, together with a form on which the president could indicate his willingness to cooperate and, if willing, to name a contact person and indicate the number of forms required to survey 20 per cent of both faculty and administrators.

Fourteen of the 17 responded with seven out of state and four Florida colleges willing to participate. One other out of state college district indicated a willingness to participate but, because of the degree of autonomy granted each college (campus) it was suggested that each college be contacted individually. Self-imposed time restrictions mitigated against this action and, since the response had been so favorable, it was decided not to include this district.

Questionnaires were mailed out the end of November with a plea to respond before Christmas (Appendix E). Replies continued to arrive after Christmas and data was adjusted to include responses received through January 7, 1974. These responses included 226 of a potential 606 faculty (37 per cent) and 70 of a potential 111 administrators (63 per cent). Overall return was 296 of a potential 717 or 41 per cent, which was felt to be an adequate sampling.

It was anticipated that these questionnaires could be classified as coming from within Florida or from out of the state through the postmark. However, a very large number were returned with no postmark. As a consequence, the results have been divided

into three categories, i.e., Florida, out of state and unclassified.

The data obtained from the questionnaires were treated descriptively. Various categories of responses were established and percentages calculated to determine the strengths and weaknesses of various methods of faculty participation in the governance process of community colleges.

RESULTS

Results of the Valencia survey are presented first, item by item, and grouped by faculty and administrators. This same general format was used for responses from other colleges using all three location classifications, then combining all faculty and all administrators for an overall result.

To shorten the body into a more meaningful and readable report complete tabular data has been placed in appendices at the end of the paper. These appendices are referred to throughout the results section and are also identified in the Table of Contents.

Valencia Community College Questionnaire

Item 1 requests the respondent to identify those organizations on which he has served as a member since employment at Valencia.

Of the twelve administrators responding, none had served as a member of the Faculty Forum Board of Advisors. Three had served on committees of the Faculty Forum, ten had served on college wide committees appointed by the president or his designate, six had served on the Administrative Council and five had served on other bodies concerned with governance.

of the 50 faculty members responding, 27 had served on the Faculty Forum Board of Advisors, 29 on committees of the Faculty Forum, 33 on college wide committees, eight on the Administrative

Council and eight in other capacities. This high rate of participation in the governance process seems to indicate that interested and involved faculty were the ones who responded to the questionnaire which may, or may not, bias the results.

Item 2 states: Has your participation on any of the above bodies influenced the formulation of policies and procedures in the governance of Valencia Community College?

Of those Valencia Faculty members responding, 37 per cent felt their participation on the various bodies of governance at Valencia Community College resulted in an influence on the formulation of policies and procedures that govern the institution. On the other hand, 35 per cent of the faculty responding to the item felt their participation on the various bodies of governance had no influence on the formulation of policies and procedures. Twenty-eight per cent of the faculty did not respond to item 2. These results are given in Table 1, Appendix F.

In contrast to the above, it was revealed that 100 per cent of the administrators responding to the V.C.C. questionnaire indicated that their participation on the various bodies of governance influenced the formulation of policies and procedures that govern Valencia. See Table 2, Appendix F, for a summary of specific responses.

Of the 37 per cent of the faculty who felt their participation on the various bodies of governance had influenced the formulation of policies and procedures, 53 per cent saw procedures change as a result of committee recommendations. Another 35 per cent saw a general recommendation result in a new policy. Twelve

per cent of this group gave the Faculty Forum credit for initiating a procedural change.

Of the 35 per cent of the faculty who felt their participation on the various bodies of governance had had no influence, 56 per cent indicated that policy decisions are made by the administrators before the committees meet. Another 38 per cent of the "no" respondents felt that committees were not active, therefore, non-functional. Six per cent revealed that the functions of committees is to advise--not to formulate policy. Table 3, Appendix F, summarizes these results.

Of the 11 administrators responding to item 2, 100 per cent checked "yes." Of the 100 per cent, 46 per cent served on a committee where policies and procedures were formulated, 36 per cent revealed that their suggestions had been followed. Lastly, 18 per cent felt that department chairmen initiated the formulation of policy. These results are summarized in Table 4, Appendix F.

Item 3 required the respondents to rate the probable future effectiveness of the faculty in formulating policy and procedures through four basic types of organizations which, singly and in combination resulted in a total of 10 possible mechanisms.

In order to provide a more meaningful analysis, the six possible ratings were grouped as follows:

0 (Unknown) - the respondent felt incapable of rating this particular mechanism.

1 (Very Highly Effective) and 2 (Highly Effective) were combined into one group. Answers in either of these categories

reflected the respondent's belief that this mechanism would provide a very effective voice for the faculty in the formulation of policies and procedures.

3 (Effective) and 4 (Adequate) were also combined into one group. Answers in either of these categories reflected the respondent's belief that this mechanism could adequately serve the faculty, but would not serve as effectively as one checked "1" or "2."

5 (Inadequate) - Responses in this category reflect the respondent's belief that such a mechanism would be ineffective and could not serve as the voice of the faculty.

Faculty responses reflect that the Faculty Senate would be the most desireable mechanism for a very effective faculty voice in the formulation of policy and procedures (11 responses). However, the mechanism that was chosen as most likely to serve the faculty is the College Council with 21 responses. If we combine all four responses indicating a mechanism that will provide the faculty with a voice in policy formulation the Faculty Senate with 28 responses is preferred by one vote over the College Council with 27 responses. The next most preferred mechanism, both as the best mechanism and as an adequate mechanism is the combination of a Faculty Senate and a College Wide Council, apparently in the belief that the Senate would provide a voice distinctly for faculty matters, with the Council providing the voice for all matters not related solely to the faculty. This data is summarized in Table 5, Appendix F.

The Valencia administrators, on the other hand, indicated

that the use of administratively appointed committees would best serve the faculty in providing a voice in the governance process (6 responses). As an adequate voice, the Faculty Senate received the greatest support with seven responses. If we again combine all four positive responses, we find the College Wide Council and Administratively Appointed Committees tied with 11 responses each. This data is summarized in Table 6, Appendix F.

Item 4 of the questionnaire requests the respondent to indicate which of three ways the faculty should be organized in the multi-campus setting. First, a centralized organization with one body representing all faculty on all campuses. Secondly, a decentralized organization in which each campus would have almost complete autonomy. Thirdly, a decentralized organization in which each campus would be semi-autonomous, but with coordinating bodies organized on a college wide basis.

Of the 50 Valencia faculty responding to the Questionnaire, 42 (84 per cent) responded to item 4. Of the item respondents only two (four per cent) perceived the centralized form of organization as the one preferred. Only five (ten per cent) viewed complete decentralization and individual campus autonomy as the desired form of organization. The remaining 35 (70 per cent) felt that faculty should participate in the governance process through semi-autonomous bodies on each campus with some form of central coordinating body to insure unified college wide direction.

All administrators completing the questionnaire responded to this item. None of the administrators wanted a centralized

body and only two (16.7 per cent) wanted complete decentralization. The remaining ten (83.3 per cent) preferred semi-autonomous campus bodies with central coordination.

The results of Item 4 are tabulated in Table 7, Appendix F.

Questionnaire Completed by Personnel of Other Colleges

Item 1 requests the respondent to identify the type of mechanism by which the faculty of his college participate in the governance of the institution.

The most predominate form of mechanism listed by those respondents clearly identified as from states other than Florida was the College Wide Council consisting of representatives from all interested groups, including the faculty. Florida faculty indicated the Faculty Senate as being the predominate form of faculty governance mechanism, while Administratively Appointed Committees rated the largest number of responses from faculty members whose return bore no postmark. When all replies are grouped, the Faculty Senate received the largest number of responses (137) with Administratively Appointed Committees running a close second with 132 responses.

The response of the Administrators bore a striking similarity, even though not exactly identical. Out of state administrators selected Administratively Appointed Committees as the dominate form of mechanism. The same category drew the largest number of responses from the unpostmarked group, while Florida administrators indicated the Faculty Senate as being the dominate mechanism. When all responses were grouped, the same mechanisms

chosen by the faculty placed first and second, except in reverse order. Administratively Appointed Committees received 48 responses with the Faculty Senate receiving 42.

The results for Item 1 are summarized in Table 1, Appendix G.

Item 2 requested the respondent to indicate whether his faculty organization was centralized or decentralized. Although no specific category for indicating the semi-autonomous form of organization was given, a number of respondents explained their mechanism as being essentially such a type and are shown as "both" in Table 2, Appendix G.

Out of state faculty and administrators both indicated the campus was the unit served by the faculty body. Faculty and administrators both from Florida and from those locations that could not be identified responded that the faculty organization served the college as an entity. The Florida results must, however, be viewed with caution since Florida law requires that each community college district form one college with one president. Because this president is ultimately responsible for all occurances on all campuses, this could well bias Florida colleges toward the creation of a single faculty body.

When all results are combined, both faculty (93 responses) and administrators (29 responses) indicated that faculty organizations serve the entire college in the majority of instances.

Data on this item is summarized in Table 2, Appendix G.

Item 3 of the survey of faculty and administrators from other institutions states: Do you feel your faculty has been effective in influencing the formulation of policies and procedures in the governance of your institution?

Of the 66 Florida faculty who responded, 53 per cent felt that the faculty had influenced the formulation of policies and procedures in the governance at their respective institutions. On the other hand, 24 (36 per cent) indicated that the faculty was not effective as an influential body in the governance of the institution. Another nine per cent revealed a "to a degree" attitude.

The respondents were also asked to specify the degree of effectiveness in ten identified areas. The same rating scale and combination of responses used for Valencia Personnel in estimating the success of different mechanisms was used to give greater meaning to the results.

Florida faculty checked the "1-2" category most frequently in the area of curriculum and instruction, while the inadequate (5) rating appeared most frequently in the area of evaluation of department heads and other supervisors. In the "3-4" category 283 responses were tabulated. Again, this indicates a degree of overall effectiveness in the areas surveyed. All responses to this item are summarized in Table 3, Appendix G.

Of those out of state faculty responding to Item 3, 69 per cent felt their faculty had influenced the formulation of policies and procedures in the governance of their institutions. Of this group 28 per cent were not satisfied with the ability of their faculty to influence college policy and procedure. This group saw the faculty as most influential in the area of curriculum and instruction. The area of budget received the "inadequate" rating most frequently. These results are contained in Table 4, Appendix G.

Of the faculty whose location could not be established, 76 per cent saw the faculty as being an effective body in influencing the formulation of policies and procedures in the governance of their institutions. Only 17 per cent indicated dissatisfaction with their ability to influence policy and procedure at their institutions. Again, this group indicated that the faculty was most influential in the area of curriculum and instruction and least influential in the area of facilities. In the "3-4" (effective) category 433 responses were recorded. See Table 5, Appendix G, for further explanation of data derived from this item.

When all three categories of faculty are combined, 67 per cent indicated their faculty was influential in policy and procedure formulation at their respective institutions. Of these, 27 per cent felt their faculty were not effective in influencing policy and procedural changes at their institutions. The responses of the combined group indicated that faculty was highly effective in the area of curriculum and instruction while the faculty showed the least influence in the development of evaluation of department heads and other supervisors. In the "3-4" (effective) category, 1092 responses were tabulated. The combined group saw the faculty as neither highly effective nor not effective, but, "effective" in influencing policy and procedures in the ten areas listed. See Table 6, Appendix G.

Responses of Florida administrators to this same item showed 73 per cent as viewing the faculty as effective and influential in the formulation of policies and procedures in the

governance process. Of this same group, 27 per cent disagreed with this belief. A tabulation of responses to part two revealed that the faculty was most influential in the area of curriculum and instruction and least influential in the area of evaluation of department heads and other supervisors. See Table 7, Appendix G, for more information.

Of the 19 out of state administrators a majority, 16 (84 per cent), saw the faculty as an effective body in the governance process. The out of state administrators saw the faculty as being highly effective in the formulation of policies concerning curriculum and instruction and salary schedules. In the "3-4" (effective) rating a total of 110 responses were tabulated for all areas listed. Refer to Table 8, Appendix G, for more information.

Of those administrators whose location could not be ascertained, a majority (84 per cent) perceived the faculty as an important body in the governance process. See Table 9, Appendix G, for complete figures.

Of the total 70 administrators responding to the questionnaire, 80 per cent felt that the faculty was effective in influencing the formulation of policies and procedures at their institutions. The "1-2" (highly effective) category revealed 40 responses in the curriculum and instruction area. Of 700 total responses, 399 were in the "3-4" (effective) category. When considering all areas listed, it appears the faculty was generally effective in influencing the formulation of policies and procedures as related to the identified areas. See Table 10, Appendix G.

Florida faculty named an effective faculty organization as the prime reason for success with 13 (37 per cent) of the respondents giving this reason. The second most important reason was the attitude of the president and other administrators as indicated by the response of 10 (29 per cent) of the faculty. See Table 11, Appendix G, for a complete listing of responses.

For out of state faculty the attitude of the president or other administrators received 51 per cent of the responses, making this reason far and away the most popular. An open line of communication rated second with 23 per cent of the respondents indicating it as the prime reason. All reasons and the number of respondents indicating each are included in Table 12, Appendix G.

For those faculty whose location could not be identified, 47 per cent indicated that the attitude of the president and other administrators was the prime reason for the effectiveness of the mechanism for faculty participation in the governance process. Of the remainder, 28 per cent felt an effective faculty organization was a necessity for effective faculty participation. See Table 13, Appendix G, for a complete listing.

Of the total faculty responding, 50 per cent assigned the attitude of the president and other administrators as the most important for faculty participation in the governance process. of the remainder, 36 (27 per cent) cited the importance of an "effective" faculty organization. See Table 14, Appendix G.

Of the Florida administrators, 21 (38 per cent) saw an involved faculty as the prime reason for effective participation in the governance of their institutions. About one-third

(33 per cent) of the responses fell in the "open line of communication" category. Table 15, Appendix G, reveals further data.

Of out of state administrators, 7 (35 per cent) again revealed the significance of an open and receptive attitude on the part of the administration for the effectiveness of a participatory mechanism of governance. Secondly, 35 per cent saw effective communication as relevant to the success of any participatory model of governance. Table 16, Appendix G, has further data on out of state administrators.

Of the unidentified administrators, 71 per cent again cited the significance of the attitude of the president and his administrative staff. See Table 17, Appendix G.

The prime reason stated by the total administrative group for the effectiveness of their mechanism for faculty participation in college governance was an open and receptive attitude of the president and administrators. Another 23 per cent cited effective communication as a key to participatory governance. See Table 18, Appendix G.

Item 5 requested each respondent to identify which body identified in Item 1 has been most effective as the voice of the faculty in college governance.

Of those faculty members identified as being from the state of Florida, 33 per cent felt their Faculty Forum organization was most effective as a voice of the faculty in college governance. This compares to only 19 per cent of the faculty members identified as being out of state who picked the forum as the model as being most effective. Those faculty whose location could not be determined said 29 per cent believed the Faculty

Forum method was best. When all categories were totaled, 24 per cent felt the Faculty Forum method of organization was best, while of all administrators, only 13 per cent believed the forum to be the most effective form of organization. The choice of all faculty for the most effective organization was the Faculty Senate with 31 per cent choosing this organizational form. The administrators chose College Wide Committees as the most effective voice of the faculty (36 per cent) placing the senate second with only 30 per cent choosing it. The college wide committee that found such favor with the administrators placed fourth with the faculty with ten per cent choosing this organization as the most effective voice.

The faculty saw little difference between the College Wide Committees and the College Wide Council approach which received 11 per cent of the choices.

These comparisons indicate that the faculty and administrators have differing views as to which organizational method offers the faculty its most effective voice in college governance. It is also interesting that a large number of the respondents appear to be undecided about what constitutes an effective voice since 14 per cent of the administrators and 20 per cent of the faculty did not respond to this item.

It is also interesting to compare views on effectiveness from both faculty and administrators from out of state institutions and those institutions located within the state of Florida.

Both Florida and out of state faculty agreed that the Faculty Senate organization was the most effective voice of the faculty in college governance with 48 per cent of Florida faculty and 28 per

cent of out of state faculty indicating this choice. The Faculty Forum organizational concept came in second for both with 23 per cent of Florida faculty and 19 per cent of out of state faculty selecting the forum as the most effective voice. However, the out of state faculty also felt very strongly about the College Wide Council form of voice with 18 per cent indicating it as the most effective voice of the faculty. Out of state faculty also appeared to have more confidence in committees appointed by the college administration with 15 per cent selecting it as the most effective voice while only six per cent of Florida faculty chose this form of organization.

When the choices of the administrators are compared, there appears to be a more divergent opinion as to what mechanism gives the faculty the most effective voice in college governance.

While 26 per cent of out of state administrators felt the Faculty Forum was the most effective voice of the faculty, only four per cent of Florida administrators agreed. The Faculty Senate which was selected as best by faculty was also chosen by 50 per cent of Florida administrators but by only 21 per cent of the out of state administrators.

There was also a great difference between the two different groups of administrators on the effectiveness of the College Wide Council concept. Of the Florida administrators, 30 per cent chose this form as being most effective while only 11 per cent of the out of state administrators felt this to be so.

Florida administrators also appeared to be more willing to express their beliefs as to the effectiveness of the various

forms of faculty organization since only four per cent failed to complete the item while 21 per cent of the out of state administrators omitted the item.

The complete results for Item 5 are tabulated in Tables 19 through 26, Appendix G.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has revealed that each college is unique in its method of providing for faculty participation in the governance process. Further, not all personnel of the college perceive this mechanism in the same way, nor do they perceive its effectiveness in the same way.

However, one trend that projected through the entire study was that the attitude of the personnel was more important to the success of faculty participation than any other factor. Although the faculty organization was also listed quite high (27 per cent), the comments accompaning this reason leads to the belief that the provision of a mechanism is more important than the actual form the mechanism takes.

Also, the decentralized form of participation with a central body for coordination of those matters pertaining to the entire college or district provides the greatest satisfaction.

It is recommended that Valencia Community College continue its present Faculty Forum organization to develop recommendations on those items concerning only the faculty. It is further recommended that each campus establish its own forum with its own constitution and by-laws. Further, that the college establish a College Wide Council comprised of all constituencies of the college (administration, faculty, career staff and students) to conduct hearings, debate the alternatives and consequences and

make recommendations on matters concerning the entire college. Faculty representation on this body may come from the elected officers of the forum established on each campus, or may be elected from each forum's membership. It may be necessary to duplicate this council, on a smaller scale, on each campus to insure that all constituencies are represented on campus matters involving constituencies other than faculty.

This last recommendation is made in view of the large number of responses indicating that this form of organization is already in existence on many campuses in many colleges. This appears to have evolved because of the increasing demands by both students and college staff for a voice in decisions affecting their welfare. Early provision for participation by these constituencies appears to be a necessity. However, since this study was concerned with faculty participation, and the data was derived solely from responses by faculty and administrators, a further, broader study should provide the data necessary to establish this more inclusive body and insure an adequate voice for these other constituencies.

SUMMARY STATEMENT
D. WILLIAM EDWARDS

Any participational model of governance has three internal constituencies: administration, faculty and staff and students. Each constituency needs a mechanism through which its ligitimate interests are identified, formalized and represented in relationship with other constituencies. (Richardson, Blocker and Bender) This practicum dealt with the effectiveness of the faculty in the formulation of policies and procedures that govern the institution. This researcher was primarily concerned with faculty participation in the governance process at a multi-campus college. Would the present Valencia Community College faculty organization meet the needs of a multi-campus college? What is the best mechanism of governance to insure faculty participation in the participatory governance process? How did other faculty and administrators perceive the effectiveness of faculty participation in the formulation of policies that govern their respective institutions?

In the quest for a "panacea" mechanism for faculty participation in the governance process for Valencia Community College in a multi-campus operation, a startling fact was revealed. There was no best mechanism. The results of this study verify the research of other investigators (Richardson, Blocker and Bender and Demerath). It is the attitude of the participants, not the

mechanism of participatory governance that is a necessity for effective faculty participation in the formulation of policies and procedures that govern the college.

Of the 266 faculty sampled, 67 per cent indicated that their faculty was influential in the formulation of policy and procedures that govern their institutions. Secondly, of the 70 administrators surveyed, 80 per cent shared the above attitude. What did these respondents cite as rationale for the effectiveness of their faculty in the governance process?

The attitude of the president and his administration was given by 50 per cent of the faculty responding. The 70 administrators surveyed again shared this attitude. Does the administration have an open and receptive attitude concerning a participatory model of governance?

On the other hand, 27 per cent of the faculty surveyed indicated that an "effective" faculty organization is essential to guarantee faculty participation in the governance process. It may be hypothesized that effective means involved. Of a total 126 faculty members at Valencia Community College, 50 responded to the questionnaire. Is the faculty at Valencia Community College willing, and ready, to accept leadership roles in their college?

As stated by Richardson, Block and Bender, a participatory model of governance that is suitable for a single campus college can be modified for a multi-campus institution. The present faculty organization, system of administrative committees, councils and task forces can meet the needs of the "East Campus" opening in the Fall of 1975 with slight modification.

Of the 50 faculty respondents to the Valencia questionnaire, 70 per cent favored a semi-autonomous mechanism of governance for the faculty at each campus. It was also recommended that some form of central coordinating body be established to insure college wide direction. Of the administrators responding, 83 per cent shared the same opinion. Richardson, Block and Bender also see the need for a semi-autonomous faculty organization. Some matters will involve only the campus faculty, whereas, other matters will involve the total faculty of all campuses.

In summary, Valencia Community College has the internal constituencies necessary for a participatory structure of governance. The faculty and administration must not assume adversary roles but, rather, shared authority roles.

SUMMARY STATEMENT
KENNETH W. HISE

In their study Richardson, Blocker and Bender show that any mechanism for effective participational governance must provide for input by the constituencies comprising the administrators, the faculty and the students. To these three constituencies, this researcher feels that there must also be added the career staff employees without whom the college would cease to operate. This belief is predicated on the large number of instances in which the College Wide Council form of participatory governance was reported as in existence, including representatives of these employees as one of the constituent groups.

Another revelation made by this study is that probably no single form of governance mechanism exists as the mechanism. All forms appear to be represented, to some degree, on almost all campuses. Further, it appears that the form of mechanism is less important than the attitude of those who make the system work. An open and receptive attitude on the part of the administration, particularly the president, is an essential ingredient for any form of participatory governance. As far as the faculty is concerned, there was frequent reference to the attitude and commitment of the faculty toward participatory governance. An active, aggressive faculty organization guided by capable leaders who adequately represent the viewpoint of the faculty also appears to be an essential ingredient to success. In short, the provision

of a mechanism and a willingness on the part of all involved to make it work appears to be of far more significance than the actual form the mechanism takes.

The actual forms the mechanism for participatory governance has taken include a committee of the whole faculty with elected leaders (defined as a Faculty Forum), a representative body of elected faculty members (defined as a Faculty Senate), a council of department heads in which the department heads are elected by the faculty members and thus becoming representative of the faculty, various committees created both by the administration and the faculty body and the college wide council comprised of representatives of all constituencies of the college which, in some cases, includes lay members from the community. Each form of participation has been tailored to meet the individual circumstances present on each college or campus.

There was also disclosed a positive trend toward semi-autonomous groups on each campus with central coordinating bodies to insure that each campus met the overall needs of the entire college or district. A centralized body for all campuses apparently will not adequately meet the needs of each campus, while complete decentralization with each campus autonomous will not provide the necessary direction to insure the college meets all its goals. The semi-autonomous form appears to overcome both these difficulties in the best manner.

Since almost all forms of governance can, with minor modification be expanded from the single campus operation to meet the needs of a multi-campus operation, this researcher believes that

the present Faculty Forum type of organization (with a forum on each campus), with the addition of a central council with representation from all constituences, to provide central guidance would provide the faculty of Valencia Community College with an adequate voice in the governance process.

However, the very low rate of completion of the questionnaires by Valencia faculty indicates a possibility that many of these faculty members are quite unconcerned about faculty participation in governance. If this participation is to be truly effective and representative, then both the administration and the Faculty Forum must take positive steps to increase the interest of the faculty and reward this interest with the development of a feeling that their participation is both welcome and beneficial to the college. Unless this occurs, there remains the possibility that other constituencies can maintain that faculty input may be discounted since it is not representative of the entire faculty, but represents only the viewpoint of that minority vocal enough to express its views.

SUMMARY STATEMENT
STANLEY MELNICK

The results of our study clearly show that the most important ingredient for an active and effective faculty for a multi-campus is the attitude the faculty and administration have toward one another. The type of organization through which they participate in governance is clearly secondary to the positive relationship needed between administration and faculty as discussed by Richardson, Blocker and Bender.

Administrators and faculty expressed the same view that a positive attitude was a must regardless of the organization used. Good people who care will make any type of organization work.

The faculty of Valencia Community College by over 50 per cent, expressed the above viewpoint while only 27 per cent thought that an effective faculty organization was the most important ingredient for effective faculty participation in college governance.

At Valencia our survey clearly showed that our administrators and faculty desire to have a decentralized campus mechanism with central guidance (Table 7, Appendix F.). It would be most appropriate to recommend that this type of format then be used for Valencia Community College when we become a multi-campus college in the Fall of 1975.

Our internal Valencia Community College questionnaire pointed out that nearly 36 per cent of our faculty felt that they did not have any influence on the formulation of policy at V.C.C. This attitude could constitute a danger to this college unless the faculty and administration do become aware of this high percentage of dissatisfaction. We must take appropriate steps to reverse this trend.

Only 50 faculty out of a total of 126 answered our questionnaire. I believe this indicates a very low percentage of V.C.C. faculty take part in and care about the governance of V.C.C. for one reason or another. I would speculate that those who did answer are the interested and involved faculty at Valencia.

The present Faculty Forum organization can be transferred to a multi-campus environment when Valencia Community College opens its second campus in the Fall of 1975. Our problem is to get the faculty involved, to get our faculty to care and take an active role in governance. The type of organization used to achieve this doesn't matter. Demerath has suggested one of the problems we at Valencia face when we have attempted an effective shared authority model is the failure of communication between faculty and administration. I believe the lack of participation by faculty is their failure to question their own attitudes toward the giving of time and talent in taking the first step forward active and effective participation in the governance process.

Valencia, if it is to move forward, must move away from the old position of faculty/administration adversary roles and develop a community of trust and fellowship. If this is achieved, then our current forms of faculty participation can become effective.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

1. American Association for HIgher Education and the National Education Association. Faculty Participation in Academic Governance. Washington, D. C., 1967.

2. Demerath, N. J. Power, Presidents, and Professors. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

3. Kudde, R. and E. Multer. "Shared Governance: Hard Work But Worth It." Community and Junior College Journal, October, 1973, 44.

4. Monroe, C. M. Profile of a Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

5. Nelson, M. "The Moraine Mix." Community and Junior College Journal, October, 1973, 44.

6. Pankratz, Herbert R. "First Steps in Faculty Organization." Junior College Journal, 1969, 40.

7. Richardson, R. C., C. E. Blocker and T. W. Bender. Governance for the Two Year College. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

8. Schirmel, David. "Conditional Decision-making: An Alternative to the Committee Octopus." Journal of Higher Education, v. XLII, No. 2, February 1972, 85.

9. Steger, R. I. Policy Formation in Illinois Public Community Colleges. Doctoral Dissertation, Illinois State University, Normal, Ill., 1965.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A

October 22, 1973

Dr. George M. Barton
Director of Practicums
Nova University
3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314

Dear George:

At my request, the members of our Nova Cluster Center from Valencia Community College are coordinating their next practicum efforts in the area of multi-campus community college governance. One particular area of needed research is that of faculty participation in the governance of multi-campus community colleges. Three of our faculty members, Ken Hise, Stan Melnick and Bill Edwards, are proposing to study this particular area. The title of their practicum will be "A Proposal For Faculty Participation in Multi-campus Governance at Valencia Community College". I feel that this research will be of great help to Valencia as we plan this next step in our development. I hope that you will give your approval to this particular study.

I continue to be extremely pleased with the participation of our faculty in the Nova Cluster Center. Please let me know if I may be of any help to you at Nova at any time.

Sincerely,

James F. Gollattscheck
President

JFG/ae

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

VALENCIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE PERSONNEL:

With the plans to open a new campus, one area of concern is the form faculty participation should take in the governance process to insure the best operation of the college in a multi-campus setting.

Your response to this questionnaire will provide valuable data on which to formulate this policy. Please DO NOT identify yourself. Return the questionnaire to the mail box of D.W. Edwards, K. Hise or S. Melnick in the Social Sciences Office, Building 3, Mail Code 10.

Thank you, in advance, for taking time from a busy schedule to respond to these few items.

What is your status? Administrator ☐ Faculty ☐

1. Check each of the following on which you have served as a member since employment at Valencia.

_____ Faculty Forum Board of Advisors (Includes Officers).
_____ Committee of the Faculty Forum.
_____ Committee Appointed by the Administration (College Wide).
_____ Administrative Council
_____ Other _____.

2. Has your participation on any of the above bodies influenced the formulation of policies and procedures in the governance at VCC?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, in what way? If no, why not?

3. How would you rate the probable future effectiveness of the faculty in influencing the formulation of college policies and procedures in a multi-campus environment in each of the following forms? Use the following scale:

0 - Unknown
1 - Very Highly Effective
2 - Highly Effective
3 - Effective
4 - Adequate
5 - Inadequate

_____ a. Faculty Forum Type of Organization.
_____ b. Faculty Senate (Representative) Type of Organization.
_____ c. College Wide Council Type of Organization.
_____ d. Participation on Administrative Appointed (College Wide) Committees.
_____ e. Both a and c, above.
_____ f. Both b and c, above.
_____ g. In a, c and d, above.
_____ h. In b, c and d, above.
_____ i. Both a and d, above.
_____ j. Both b and d, above.

4. In view of your responses to the above, how do you perceive the role of the faculty organization and participation in influencing the formulation of college policies and procedures in a multi-campus environment at VCC?

_____ Centralized - One body or committee deliberating and reporting for all campuses of the college.

_____ Decentralized - Each campus having autonomy in most decisions with its own faculty organization and committees.

_____ Decentralized with central coordination - Each campus semi-autonomous with its own bodies, but with coordinating bodies providing direction to the college as a whole.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX C

Valencia Community College is presently developing plans for the opening of a second campus. One of the concerns is what type of organization will provide for faculty participation in the governance process while assuring the best operation of the college.

Your cooperation in completing the following questionnaire would provide valuable data for accomplishing this task. To insure that your responses will remain confidential, do not identify yourself or your institution and use the attached return envelope.

Thank you for taking time out from a busy schedule to provide us with information which we feel will help us provide a better college.

What is your status? Administrator ☐ Faculty ☐

Faculty only - Have you ever been an officer or member of the board of your faculty organization? Yes ☐ No ☐

1. What is the mechanism by which your faculty participates in the governance at your college?

		Yes	No
a.	Faculty Forum (Total Faculty Group)	☐	☐
b.	Faculty Senate (Representative Body)	☐	☐
c.	College Wide Council (Representation from all Segments of the College)	☐	☐
d.	Administratively Appointed Committees	☐	☐
e.	Faculty Body (Forum or Senate) Committees	☐	☐
f.	Other _____	☐	☐

2. Do these bodies serve the entire college or district? Or is each campus independent? ☐

Could you briefly explain?

3. Do you feel your faculty has been effective in influencing the formulation of policies and procedures in the governance at your institution? Yes ☐ No ☐

Specify the degree of effectiveness in the following areas based on the scale:

0 - Unknown
1 - Very Highly Effective
2 - Highly Effective
3 - Effective
4 - Adequate
5 - Inadequate

_____ Overall Policy.
_____ Curriculum and Instruction.
_____ Student Activities.
_____ Evaluation of Instructional Personnel.
_____ Evaluation of Department Heads and Other Supervisors.
_____ Facilities.
_____ Budget.
_____ Salary Schedules.
_____ Personnel Actions.
_____ Resolving Grievances.

4. If your response to Item 3 was "yes", what would you give as the prime reason for the effectiveness of your mechanism for faculty participation in college governance?

5. Which one of the bodies identified in Item 1, above, has been most effective as the voice of the faculty in college governance?

Thank you, again, for your cooperation.

If your envelope has been misplaced, please return this form to:

D.W. Edwards - K. Hise - S. Melnick
Mail Code 10
Valencia Community College
P.O. Box 3028
Orlando, FL 32802

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D

VALENCIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
P.O. BOX 3028 ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

October 25, 1973

Dear

At my request the NOVA University Cluster Center at Valencia Community College has agreed to work together in a practicum study of multi-campus operation and organization. As a part of this study, three faculty members have selected the area of faculty participation in the governance of multi-campus community colleges. They have developed a questionnaire which they hope to send to all of the multi-campus community colleges in Florida and several selected community colleges out of Florida. Through this study they will attempt to catalog the variety of types of faculty organizations in multi-campus colleges as well as the faculty and administrative perceptions of the relative effectiveness of the various types of organization.

Your college is one that has been selected for this study. With your permission, the committee wishes to send copies of the enclosed questionnaire to whomever you would designate for distribution to your faculty and administration. Individual community colleges will not be identified in any way in the report produced through this research. We will however be happy to share a copy of the final report with all participants.

Please complete and return the attached forms indicating your response to our request.

Sincerely,

James F. Gollattscheck
President

JFG/ae

APPENDIX E

VALENCIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
P.O. BOX 3028 ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32802

November 27, 1973

MEMORANDUM

The following are enclosed:

Copy of questionnaire indicating your President's approval for participation in this survey, together with the number of questionnaires required and indicating you as the coordinator for this survey.

Sufficient copies of the questionnaire to meet your indicated requirements.

Sufficient "business reply" envelopes for each participant to return his questionnaire individually to Valencia.

Would you please distribute the questionnaires and encourage all your participants to return them as soon as possible? The committee working on this project hopes to compile the data and draft its report during the Christmas break.

Thank you, again, for your cooperation in participating in this study.

APPENDIX F

DATA DERIVED FROM QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO VALENCIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE PERSONNEL

Table 1

Faculty Responses to Item 2

Total N	Yes Response		No Response		No Comment	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
46	17	37	16	35	13	28

Table 2

Administrator Responses to Item 2

Total N	Yes Response		No Response		No Comment	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
11	11	100	0	0	0	0

Table 3

Categories of Faculty Response to Item 2 (N = 46)

Response 1 "Yes" (Influenced formulation of policy) N = 17		
Category	Number	Per cent
A general recommendation resulted in a new policy.	6	35
A procedure changed as a result of committee recommendation.	9	53
A procedure changed as a result of action by the Faculty Forum.	2	12
Totals	17	100
Response 2 "No" (Did not influence formulation of policy) N = 16		
The policy decisions are made by the administrators before the committee meets.	9	56
Committees are not active; therefore non-functional.	6	28
Committees only advise; they do not make policy.	1	6
Totals	16	100
Response 3 "No comment."	13	36*

*Of total respondents to this item.

Table 4

Categories of Administrator Responses to Item 2 (N = 11)

Response 1 "Yes" (Influenced the formulation of policy) N = 11

Category	Number	Per cent
Served on committees where policies were formulated.	5	46
Suggestions have been followed.	4	36
Department chairmen start the formulation of policy.	2	18
Totals	11	100

Table 5

Faculty Preferences for Governance Mechanisms

Mechanism	Unknown	Highly Satisfactory	Functional	Inadequate
Faculty Forum	9	4	19	18
Faculty Senate	15	11	17	7
College Wide Council	15	6	21	8
Committees	11	4	19	16
Forum/Council	24	7	13	6
Senate/Council	22	7	17	4
Forum/Council/ Committees	26	6	15	3
Senate/Council/ Committees	27	5	12	6
Forum/Committees	24	3	11	12
Senate/Committees	24	5	12	9

Table 6

Administrators Preferences for Governance Mechanisms

Mechanism	Unknown	Highly Satisfactory	Functional	Inadequate
Faculty Forum	1	3	6	2
Faculty Senate	4	1	7	0
College Wide Council	0	5	6	1
Committees	0	6	5	1
Forum/Council	2	4	4	2
Senate/Council	3	2	6	1
Forum/Council/ Committees	5	3	4	0
Senate/Council/ Committees	4	1	7	0
Forum/Committees	3	3	6	0
Senate/Committees	3	0	8	1

Table 7

Organizational Format for Participation in Governance in the Multi-Campus Setting

Personnel	Centralized		Decentralized		Decentralized Central Guidance	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Administrators	0	0	2	16.7	10	83.3
Faculty	2	4	5	10.0	35	70.0

A P P E N D I X G

DATA DERIVED FROM QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO PERSONNEL OF OTHER COLLEGES

Table 1

Mechanisms for Faculty Participation in College Governance

Mechanism	Out of State Respondents	Florida Respondents	Unclassified Respondents	All Respondents
	As perceived by faculty.			
Faculty Forum	23	33	37	93
Faculty Senate	37	48	52	137
College Wide Council	41	25	32	98
Administrative Committees	30	42	60	132
Faculty Body Committees	38	31	46	115
Other	5	6	7	18
	As perceived by administrators.			
Faculty Forum	9	8	9	26
Faculty Senate	9	23	10	42
College Wide Council	11	13	15	39
Administrative Committees	14	15	19	48
Faculty Body Committees	7	12	15	34
Other	5	2	3	10

Table 2

Administrative Unit Served by Faculty Organization in College Governance

Administrative Unit	Out of State Respondents	Florida Respondents	Unclassified Respondents	All Respondents
	As perceived by faculty.			
College or District	6	40	47	93
Campus or College	39	7	21	67
Both (Semi-autonomous)	24	13	12	49
No Answer	5	6	6	17
	As perceived by administrators.			
College or District	3	11	15	29
Campus or College	10	3	3	16
Both (Semi-Autonomous)	5	11	6	22
No Answer	1	1	1	3

Table 3

Effectiveness of the Faculty in College Governance as Perceived by Florida Faculty

Category	Unknown	Highly Effective	Effective	Inadequate
Overall Policy	10	8	28	20
Curriculum and Instruction	5	19	32	10
Student Activities	11	6	33	16
Evaluation of Instructional Personnel	13	6	28	19
Evaluation of Department Heads and Other Supervisors	12	1	25	28
Facilities	9	7	27	23
Budget	7	11	26	22
Salary Schedules	11	10	28	17
Personnel Actions	14	6	29	17
Resolving Grievances	13	7	27	19
Totals	105	81	283	191

Has the faculty been effective in influencing the formulation of policies and procedures?

Response	Number	Per cent
Yes	35	53
No	24	36
To a degree	6	9
Unknown	1	2
Totals	66	100

Table 4

Effectiveness of the Faculty in College Governance as Perceived by Out of State Faculty

Category	Unknown	Highly Effective	Effective	Inadequate
Overall Policy	5	6	48	5
Curriculum and Instruction	3	34	32	5
Student Activities	11	26	28	9
Evaluation of Instructional Personnel	4	28	32	10
Evaluation of Department Heads and Other Supervisors	9	11	35	19
Facilities	7	18	34	15
Budget	10	6	35	23
Salary Schedules	5	13	40	16
Personnel Actions	10	13	39	12
Resolving Grievances	12	12	42	8
Totals	76	167	365	132

Has the faculty been effective in influencing the formulation of policies and procedures?

Response	Number	Per cent
Yes	51	69
No	21	28
To a degree	1	1
Unknown	1	1
Totals	74	100

Table 5

Effectiveness of the Faculty in College Governance as Perceived by Unidentified Faculty

Category	Unknown	Highly Effective	Effective	Inadequate
Overall Policy	8	13	49	16
Curriculum and Instruction	6	37	36	7
Student Activities	10	14	47	15
Evaluation of Instructional Personnel	6	13	50	17
Evaluation of Department Heads and Other Supervisors	12	6	46	22
Facilities	10	10	42	24
Budget	11	15	39	14
Salary Schedules	2	23	46	15
Personnel Actions	16	17	39	14
Resolving Grievances	8	14	49	15
Totals	89	162	443	166

Has the faculty been effective in influencing the formulation of policies and procedures?

Response	Number	Per cent
Yes	65	76
No	15	17
To a degree	3	3
Unknown	3	3
Totals	86	100

Table 6

Effectiveness of the Faculty in College Governance as Perceived by All Other College Faculty

Category	Unknown	Highly Effective	Effective	Inadequate
Overall Policy	23	27	125	51
Curriculum and Instruction	14	90	100	22
Student Activities	32	46	108	22
Evaluation of Instructional Personnel	23	47	110	46
Evaluation of Department Heads and Other Supervisors	33	18	106	69
Facilities	26	35	103	62
Budget	28	32	101	65
Salary Schedules	18	46	114	48
Personnel Actions	40	36	107	43
Resolving Grievances	33	33	118	42
Totals	270	410	1092	488

Has the faculty been effective in influencing the formulation of policies and procedures?

Response	Number	Per cent
Yes	151	67
No	60	27
To a degree	10	4
Unknown	5	2
Totals	226	100

Table 7

Effectiveness of the Faculty in College Governance as Perceived by Florida Administrators

Category	Unknown	Highly Effective	Effective	Inadequate
Overall Policy	0	3	19	4
Curriculum and Instruction	0	12	13	1
Student Activities	2	3	16	5
Evaluation of Instructional Personnel	1	6	10	9
Evaluation of Department Heads and Other Supervisors	3	2	9	12
Facilities	1	4	17	4
Budget	0	9	15	2
Salary Schedules	0	11	15	0
Personnel Actions	2	3	19	2
Resolving Grievances	1	6	16	3
Totals	10	59	149	42

Has the faculty been effective in influencing the formulation of policies and procedures?

Response	Number	Per cent
Yes	19	73
No	7	27
Totals	26	100

Table 8

Effectiveness of the Faculty in College Governance as Perceived by Out of State Administrators

Category	Unknown	Highly Effective	Effective	Inadequate
Overall Policy	0	4	14	1
Curriculum and Instruction	0	12	6	1
Student Activities	0	5	11	3
Evaluation of Instructional Personnel	1	5	11	2
Evaluation of Department Heads and Other Supervisors	2	5	10	2
Facilities	1	3	15	0
Budget	2	3	10	4
Salary Schedules	0	10	8	1
Personnel Actions	0	5	12	2
Resolving Grievances	0	4	13	2
Totals	6	56	110	18

Has the faculty been effective in influencing the formulation of policies and procedures?

Response	Number	Per cent
Yes	16	84
No	3	16
Totals	19	100

Table 9

Effectiveness of the Faculty in College Governance as Perceived by Unidentified Administrators

Category	Unknown	Highly Effective	Effective	Inadequate
Overall Policy	0	6	19	0
Curriculum and Instruction	0	16	9	0
Student Activities	3	7	14	1
Evaluation of Instructional Personnel	2	7	13	3
Evaluation of Department Heads and Other Supervisors	3	4	13	5
Facilities	1	3	18	3
Budget	1	4	19	1
Salary Schedules	0	12	9	4
Personnel Actions	0	7	16	2
Resolving Grievances	0	15	10	0
Totals	10	81	140	19

Has the faculty been effective in influencing the formulation of policies and procedures?

Response	Number	Per cent
Yes	21	84
No	4	16
Totals	25	100

Table 10

Effectiveness of the Faculty in College Governance as Perceived by All Other College Administrators

Category	Unknown	Highly Effective	Effective	Inadequate
Overall Policy	0	13	52	5
Curriculum and Instruction	0	40	28	2
Student Activities	5	15	41	9
Evaluation of Instructional Personnel	4	18	34	14
Evaluation of Department Heads and Other Supervisors	8	11	32	19
Facilities	6	10	50	4
Budget	3	16	44	7
Salary Schedules	0	33	32	5
Personnel Actions	2	15	47	6
Resolving Grievances	1	25	39	5
Totals	29	196	399	76

Has the faculty been effective in influencing the formulation of policies and procedures?

Response	Number	Per cent
Yes	56	80
No	14	20
Totals	70	100

Table 11

Reasons for Faculty Effectiveness in College Governance as Perceived by Florida Faculty

Reason for Effectiveness	Number	Per cent
Attitude of President and Administration	10	29
Strong Departments	2	6
Interested Faculty	4	11
Open Lines of Communication	6	17
Effective Faculty Organization	13	37
Totals	35	100

Table 12

Reasons for Faculty Effectiveness in College Governance as Perceived by Out of State Faculty

Reason for Effectiveness	Number	Per cent
Attitude of President and Administration	29	51
Open Lines of Communication	13	23
Effective Faculty Organization	7	12
Interested Faculty	8	14
Totals	57	100

Table 13

Reasons for Faculty Effectiveness in College Governance as Perceived by Unidentified Faculty

Reason for Effectiveness	Number	Per cent
Attitude of President and Administration	27	47
Effective Faculty Organization	16	28
Faculty Meetings	10	18
Promotion to Supervisory Positions	2	4
Chapter of American Association of University Professors	1	1.5
Instructors are Aware of the Budget	1	1.5
Totals	57	100

Table 14

Reasons for Faculty Effectiveness in College Governance as Perceived by All Other College Faculty

Reason for Effectiveness	Number	Per cent
Attitude of President and Administration	66	50
Effective Faculty Organization	36	27
Open Lines of Communication	19	14
Interested Faculty	12	9
Totals	133	100

Table 15

Reasons for Faculty Effectiveness in College Governance as Perceived by Florida Administrators

Reason for Effectiveness	Number	Per cent
Attitude of President and Administrators	7	33
Open Lines of Communication	4	19
Involved Faculty	8	38
Faculty Organization	1	5
Overall Concern for Success	1	5
Totals	21	100

Table 16

Reasons for Faculty Effectiveness in College Governance as Perceived by Out of State Administrators

Reason for Effectiveness	Number	Per cent
Attitude of President and Administrators	7	35
Open Lines of Communication	7	35
Interested Faculty	5	25
Faculty Organization	1	5
Totals	20	100

Table 17

Reasons for Faculty Effectiveness in College Governance as Perceived by Unidentified Administrators

Reason for Effectiveness	Number	Per cent
Attitude of President and Administration	15	71
Open Lines of Communication	3	14
Faculty Organization	3	14
Totals	21	100

Table 18

Reasons for Faculty Effectiveness in College Governance as Perceived by All Other College Administrators

Reason for Effectiveness	Number	Per cent
Attitude of President and Administration	29	48
Open Lines of Communication	14	23
Effective Faculty Organization	4	7
Mutual Interest and Support	13	22
Totals	60	100

Table 19

Faculty Participatory Bodies Effective in College Governance as Perceived by Florida Faculty

Participatory Body	Number	Per cent
Faculty Forum	15	23
Faculty Senate	28	42
College Wide Council	1	1
Committees	4	6
Other	5	8
None Indicated	13	20
Totals	66	100

Table 20

Faculty Participatory Bodies Effective in College Governance as Perceived by Out of State Faculty

Participatory Body	Number	Per cent
Faculty Forum	14	19
Faculty Senate	21	28
College Wide Council	13	18
Committees	11	15
Other	0	0
None Indicated	15	20
Totals	74	100

Table 21

Faculty Participatory Bodies Effective in College Governance as Perceived by Unidentified Faculty

Participatory Body	Number	Per cent
Faculty Forum	25	29
Faculty Senate	22	25
College Wide Council	11	13
Committees	8	9
None Indicated	20	23
Totals	86	100

Table 22

Faculty Participatory Bodies Effective in College Governance as Perceived by All Other College Faculty

Participatory Body	Number	Per cent
Faculty Forum	54	24
Faculty Senate	71	31
College Wide Council	25	11
Committees	23	10
Other	5	2
None Indicated	48	22
Totals	226	100

Table 23

Faculty Participatory Bodies Effective in College Governance as Perceived by Florida Administrators

Participatory Body	Number	Per cent
Faculty Forum	1	4
Faculty Senate	15	58
College Wide Council	8	30
Committees	1	4
None Indicated	1	4
Totals	26	100

Table 24

Faculty Participatory Bodies Effective in College Governance as Perceived by Out of State Administrators

Participatory Body	Number	Per cent
Faculty Forum	5	26
Faculty Senate	4	21
College Wide Council	2	11
Committees	4	21
None Indicated	4	21
Totals	19	100

Table 25

Faculty Participatory Bodies Effective in College Governance as Perceived by Unidentified Administrators

Participatory Body	Number	Per cent
Faculty Forum	3	12
Faculty Senate	2	8
College Wide Council	13	52
Committees	2	8
None Indicated	5	20
Totals	25	100

Table 26

Faculty Participatory Bodies Effective in College Governance as Perceived by All Other College Administrators

Participatory Body	Number	Per cent
Faculty Forum	9	13
Faculty Senate	21	30
College Wide Council	25	36
Committees	5	7
None Indicated	10	14
Totals	70	100

A P P E N D I X H

RESPONSIBILITIES OF INDIVIDUAL PRACTICUM PARTICIPANTS

D. William Edwards

Organization and writing of practicum proposal.

Assisted in the construction of both questionnaires.

Assisted in mailing questionnaires to participating institutions.

Analyzed data, constructed tables and assisted in the writing of the results section.

Assisted in the formulation of the recommendations section.

Participated in interviews with the Valencia Community College president.

Wrote individual summary and conclusions.

Kenneth W. Hise

Assisted in the writing of practicum proposal.

Assisted in the construction of both questionnaires.

Assisted in mailing questionnaires to participating institutions.

Analyzed data, constructed tables and assisted in the writing of the results section.

Assisted in the formulation of the recommendations section.

Participated in interviews with the Valencia Community College president.

Wrote individual summary.

Assumed responsibility for organization and preparation of final report.

Stanley Melnick

Assisted in the organization and writing of both the practicum and the practicum proposal.

Assisted in the construction of both questionnaires.

Assisted in mailing questionnaires to participating institutions.

Analyzed data, constructed tables and helped write the results section.

Contributed to the recommendations section.

Wrote individual summary.

Participated in interviews with the Valencia Community College president.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 15 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION